

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of March 8, 2007, has been reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-20, 22, 27, 28, 33, 34 and 38-40 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 21, 29, 35, 41, 43-46 and 48-50 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 21, 23-26, 29-32, 35-37 and 41-50 remain pending after entry of this amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Applicants' Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for taking the time on April 5, 2007, to conduct a personal interview with Applicants' undersigned representatives. During the interview, claim 21 was discussed. In particular, the Examiner agreed that amending claim 21 to include features described on page 14, line 28 to page 15, line 9 of Applicants' specification would overcome the current rejections. Additionally, Applicants agree with and adopt the Examiner's Interview Summary as an accurate description of the substance of interview, in conjunction with the following remarks, pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21-26, 29-32, 35-37 and 41-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piosenka *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,756, "Piosenka") in view of Shanahan (U.S. Patent No. 7,149,509, "Shanahan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 21, 29, 35 and 41 all generally relate to receiving information from a first device and transferring the received information to a second device. The received information is modified in accordance with data field size information of one or more data fields included in a data record of the second device, wherein the data record corresponds to at least one of: a calendar, a phonebook, a message box and a call register. Nowhere does either Piosenka or Shanahan, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such features. At most, Piosenka discloses the transferring of configurations from one phone to another. Col. 6, ll. 55-60. For example, Piosenka discloses software that translates user selected features/settings into specific key depresses to be sent to the cellular phone for accomplishing the programming of

such features/settings. Abstract. Even so, nowhere does Piosenka teach or suggest modifying information from one device in accordance with data field size information of one or more data fields in a data record of at least one of a calendar, a phonebook, a message box and a call register of a second device. Shanahan is similarly deficient and thus, fails to cure the deficiencies of Piosenka. As such, claims 21, 29, 35 and 41 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 23-26, 30-32, 36, 37 and 41-45 are dependent on claims 21, 29, 35 and 41, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 44 recites, *inter alia*, “modifying the first data record in accordance with the data field size information includes truncating at least a portion of the first data record.” Contrary to the Office Action’s assertions, nowhere does Piosenka or Shanahan, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such features. The Office Action asserts that Shanahan teaches “truncating at least a portion of the data first record” at col. 3, lines 44-64. However, the cited passage merely relates to converting between format types (e.g., from MIDI to WAV or MPEG). There is no teaching or suggestion in Shanahan of truncating a portion of the data record as part of the conversion or at all. Accordingly, claim 44 is also allowable for this additional reason.

Amended independent claim 46 relates to, *inter alia*, modifying data received from a first device for storage in a second device in accordance with data field size information of one or more data fields included in a data record of the second device, wherein the data record corresponds to a phonebook stored in the second device. As discussed previously with respect to claims 21, 29, 35 and 41, Piosenka merely describes the transfer of configurations from one device to another. The transfer of configurations does not constitute modifying data received from a device in accordance with data field size information of a phonebook data record of a second device. Shanahan also lacks any teaching or suggestion of such features. At most, Shanahan discloses conversion of a file from one format type to another. Col. 3, ll. 44-64. Even so, there is no teaching or suggestion that the conversion is performed in accordance with a data field size information of one or more data fields included in a data record corresponding to a phonebook. Accordingly, claim 46 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Appln. No.: 09/788,493
Amendment dated June 8, 2007
Reply to non-final Office Action of March 8, 2007

Claims 47-50 are dependent on claim 46 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 46 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 8th day of June, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001